

Appl. No.: 10/668,884
 Reply to Office Action of: June 18, 2004

Remarks

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5 stand rejected. Claims 6-10 are objected to. Claims 11-14 are withdrawn from consideration. The following remarks are addressed to the indicated paragraphs of the Office Action of June 18, 2004.

Paragraphs 1 and 2

A restriction requirement was made under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species of:

species I, shown in Figures 1-6 and claimed in claims 1-10; and

species II, shown in Figures 7-8 and claimed in claims 11-14.

A provisional election of species I was made with traverse, and claims 11-14 were withdrawn from consideration. Applicants affirm this election and cancel claims 11-14.

Paragraphs 3 and 4

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite, because it appears to recite an additional wire manager mounted on the component board which is misdescriptive and not supported by the specification or drawings. Claim 8 is canceled, obviating this ground for rejection.

Paragraphs 5 and 6

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mayer (US 6,305,556). Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is allowable because it includes a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, namely, "a hinged wire manager being mounted between one of the movable side walls and one of the outside walls." In the present invention, a hinged wire manager is mounted between a movable side wall and a fixed outside wall. In sharp contrast the wire manager of Mayer is mounted between a corner

Appl. No.: 10/668,884
Reply to Office Action of: June 18, 2004

post 306 and a rail (sliding mount 312) by a sliding coupler 316 (see Col. 2, lines 42-50). This difference is significant because mounting the wire manager to the sliding wall of the enclosure, as in the present invention, does not cause stress on the wires being managed when the drawer is opened. In Mayer, however, the wire manager is mounted to sliding mount, such as a rail of a telescoping slide rail assembly, which does not provide the same protection from stress to the wires.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and Applicants respectfully contend that they are allowable for the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Paragraphs 7 and 8

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowability of claims 6-7, 9-10. Applicants have rewritten claim 6, as suggested by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully contend that they claim 6 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 7, 9-10 depend from claim 6, and applicants respectfully contend that they are allowable for the reasons that claim 6 is allowable.

Appl. No.: 10/668,884
Reply to Office Action of: June 18, 2004

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, and in view of the amendments presented herein, the Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1-7 and 9-10 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reexamination of claims 1-7 and 9-10, allowance of claims 1-7 and 9-10 and issuance of Letters Patent for the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven E. Bach
Registration No. 46,530
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: 610.889.3697
Facsimile: 610.889.3696